

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,927	03/16/2004	Akiyoshi Aoyagi	9319S-000669	2334
27572	7590 11/14/2005		EXAMI	INER
HARNESS,	DICKEY & PIERCE,	ROSE, KIESHA L		
P.O. BOX 828			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303				
			2822	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/801,927	AOYAGI, AKIYOSHI .		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Kiesha L. Rose	2822		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI te, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 \$ 2a)□ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Thi	September 2005. s action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-5,7-10 and 12-16 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-5,7-10 and 12-16 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.			
Application Papers		•		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination.	cepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeya ction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4). □ Intonious	Summany (PTO 412)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/07/05. 	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)		

Art Unit: 2822

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed 20 September 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7-10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura et al. (U.S. Patent 6,781,241) in view of Yamamoto (JPO 2001-110979)

Nishimura discloses a semiconductor device (Figs. 8 and 16) that contains a first carrier substrate (1b), a first semiconductor chip (3b) mounted face down on the first carrier substrate, a second carrier substrate (1a), a second semiconductor chip (3c) mounted on the second carrier substrate, protruding electrodes (7) for connecting the second carrier substrate to the first carrier substrate so that the second carrier substrate is held above and spaced apart from the first semiconductor chip; a sealant (2) comprising mold resin sealing the second semiconductor chip, the second carrier substrate is fixed to the first carrier substrate so as to be mounted on the first semiconductor chip, the position of a sidewall of the sealant coincides with a sidewall of

Art Unit: 2822

the second carrier substrate, the first carrier substrate comprises a flip-chip mounted ball grid array and the second carrier substrate comprises a mold-sealed ball grip array and chip size package, the first semiconductor chip comprises a plurality of chips mounted in parallel on the first carrier substrate (Fig. 8), the second semiconductor chip comprise a plurality of stacked semiconductor chips and in parallel with second carrier substrate. In regards to the first semiconductor chip connected to the first carrier substrate by pressure welding, a "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, In re Hirao and Sato et al., 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (CCPA 1976) (footnote 3). See also In re Brown and Saffer, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972): In re Luck and Gainer, 177 USPQ 523 (CCPA 1973); In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974); and In re Marosi et al., 218 USPQ 289 (CAFC 1983) final product per se which must be determined in a "product by, all of" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Note that Applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above caselaw makes clear. Even though product -by [-] process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based upon the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product is made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985)(citations omitted)." Nishimura discloses all the limitations except for a resin provided between the first carrier and second carrier so the reverse face of the first semiconductor is

Art Unit: 2822

exposed. Whereas Yamamoto discloses a semiconductor device (Fig. 1) that contains a first carrier substrate (20) and second carrier (15) with a first semiconductor chip (19) mounted on first carrier substrate with a resin provided between the first and second carrier substrate so the reverse face of the first semiconductor chip is exposed. The resin is formed on the first semiconductor chip to seal and encapsulate the first semiconductor chip. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Nishimura by incorporating a resin between the first and second carrier substrate to encapsulate and seal the first semiconductor chip as taught by Yamamoto.

Claims 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura et al. (U.S. Patent 6,781,241) in view of Yamamoto.

Nishimura discloses a semiconductor device (Figs. 8 and 16) that contains a first carrier substrate (1b), a first electronic part (3b) mounted face down on the first carrier substrate, a second carrier substrate (1a), a second electronic part (3c) mounted on the second carrier substrate, protruding electrodes (7) for connecting the second carrier substrate to the first carrier substrate so that the second carrier substrate is held above and spaced apart from the first electronic part; a sealant (2) comprising mold resin sealing the second electronic part. Nishimura discloses all the limitations except for a resin provided between the first carrier and second carrier so the reverse face of the first electronic part is exposed. Whereas Yamamoto discloses a semiconductor device (Fig. 1) that contains a first carrier substrate (20) and second carrier (15) with a first electronic part (19) mounted on first carrier substrate with a resin provided between the

Art Unit: 2822

first and second carrier substrate so the reverse face of the first electronic part is exposed. The resin is formed on the first electronic part to seal and encapsulate the first electronic part. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Nishimura by incorporating a resin between the first and second carrier substrate to encapsulate and seal the first electronic part as taught by Yamamoto.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura et al. (U.S. Patent 6,781,241) in view of Yamamoto.

Nishimura discloses a semiconductor device (Figs. 8 and 16) that contains a first carrier substrate (1b), a first semiconductor chip (3b) mounted face down on the first carrier substrate, a second carrier substrate (1a), a second semiconductor chip (3c) mounted on the second carrier substrate, protruding electrodes (7) for connecting the second carrier substrate to the first carrier substrate so that the second carrier substrate is held above and spaced apart from the first semiconductor chip; a sealant (2) comprising mold resin sealing the second semiconductor chip and a mother substrate on which the first carrier substrate is mounted (Column 5, lines 58-61). Nishimura discloses all the limitations except for a resin provided between the first carrier and second carrier so the reverse face of the first semiconductor chip is exposed. Whereas Yamamoto discloses a semiconductor device (Fig. 1) that contains a first carrier substrate (20) and second carrier (15) with a first semiconductor chip (19) mounted on first carrier substrate with a resin provided between the first and second carrier substrate so the reverse face of the first semiconductor chip is exposed. The resin is

Art Unit: 2822

formed on the first electronic part to seal and encapsulate the first semiconductor chip.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify the device of Nishimura by incorporating a resin

between the first and second carrier substrate to encapsulate and seal the first

semiconductor chip as taught by Yamamoto.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura,

Yamamoto and Wachtler (U.S. Publication 20030022465).

Nishimura and Yamamoto disclose all the limitations except for the second chips molded and cut. Whereas Wachtler discloses wafer package (Figs. 16 and 17) that contains semiconductor chips (204) integrally molded on a carrier substrate (134) with a sealing resin where the carrier substrate is cut with the sealing resin so each piece includes one semiconductor chip. The carrier substrate is cut so as to produce individual molded chip for integrated circuit packages. (Page 6, Paragraph 62)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the devices of Nishimura and Yamamoto by incorporating cutting the carrier with the molded semiconductor chip to produce individual molded chip for integrated circuit packages as taught by Wachtler.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-10 and 12-16 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kiesha L. Rose whose telephone number is 571-272-1844. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:00 off 2nd Mondays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amir Zarabian can be reached on 571-272-1852. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KI R

Michael Trinh Primary Examiner

Wal Sil

Page 7